

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RONALD PRUDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOCTOR LONG, *et al.*,

Defendants.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CIVIL NO. 1:CV-06-2007

(Judge Caputo)

**MEMORANDUM**

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Ronald Pruden's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 31) of this Court's Order (Doc. 30) denying Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel and to Consolidate Cases (Doc. 28). For the reasons stated below, Plaintiff's Motion will be denied.

**BACKGROUND**

On October 12, 2006, Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the State Correctional Institution in Graterford, Pennsylvania, commenced a civil rights action against Defendant Doctor Long pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1983. Subsequently, Plaintiff filed an affidavit which the Court construed as a First Amended Complaint. At the time of filing his complaint, Plaintiff was confined at the Smithfield Correctional Institution in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, and alleged that he had been denied adequate medical care while confined there.

By Order dated March 28, 2007 (Doc. 27), this Court granted Defendants' unopposed Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Doc. 16). On June 25, 2007, this Court denied Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel and to Consolidate Cases as moot

because the case had been closed (Doc. 30). Plaintiff currently seeks reconsideration of the Court's Order denying his request for counsel and to consolidate cases.

### **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence. *Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki*, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir.1985). Plaintiff does not allege in his motion for reconsideration that there was an error of law or fact that needs to be corrected or that he has newly discovered evidence to present to the Court. Thus, this Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to provide the evidence required for a successful motion for reconsideration.

**ACCORDINGLY, THIS 9th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2007, IT IS HEREBY  
ORDERED THAT** Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 31) is **DENIED**.

/s/ A. Richard Caputo  
A. RICHARD CAPUTO  
United States District Judge